



WEB COPY



HCP.No.326 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.06.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S. RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

H.C.P.No.326 of 2024

Koteeswari

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi, Commissionerate.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai.

4.The Inspector of Police (L&O),
T-12, Poonamallee Police Station,
Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, calling for the records pertaining to the order of detention dated 31.01.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent in



HCP.No.326 of 2024

No.10/BCDFGISSSV/2024 and quash the same as illegal and direct the respondents to produce the detenu Saravanan, Male, aged 23 years, S/o.Sivakumar, now confined at Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai, before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthil Kumar
For Respondents : Mr.A.Gokulakrishnan,
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

M.S.RAMESH, J.
AND
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

The petitioner herein, who is the mother of the detenu namely Saravanan, aged about 23 years, S/o.Sivakumar, has come forward with this petition challenging the detention order passed by the second respondent dated 31.01.2024 slapped on her son, branding him as "Goonda" under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Cyber Law Offenders, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Sexual Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 [Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982].



HCP.No.326 of 2024

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents.

3. Though several grounds are raised in the petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that the Detaining Authority has not applied its mind while expressing its subjective satisfaction that the detainee is also likely to be released on bail. It is his submission that the case relied upon by the Detaining Authority is not similar to the present case, as the bail was granted in favour of the accused therein by recording the fact that two previous cases are pending against the accused therein. The learned counsel further submitted that though in the detention order, it is mentioned as there are 2 previous cases as against the detenu, in the remand application it is mentioned as 5 previous cases.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, this Court finds that the bail order relied upon by the Detaining Authority in CrI.M.P.No.6184 of 2018, is not similar to the case on hand since the accused therein was granted bail after recording the fact that two previous case were pending against the accused therein. However, as per the remand application, it is seen that there are 5



HCP.No.326 of 2024

previous cases as against the detainee herein. Considering the nature of the bail order in the similar case relied upon by the Detaining Authority and the case on hand, this Court finds that the subjective satisfaction of the Detaining Authority that the detainee is also likely to be released on bail, suffers from non-application of mind.

5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of ***'Rekha Vs. State of Tamil Nadu through Secretary to Government and another'*** reported in ***'2011 [5] SCC 244'***, has dealt with a situation where the Detention Order is passed without an application of mind. In case, any of the reasons stated in the order of detention is non-existent or a material information is wrongly assumed, that will vitiate the Detention Order. When the subjective satisfaction was irrational or there was non-application of mind, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the order of detention is liable to be quashed. It is relevant to extract paragraph Nos.10 and 11 of the said judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court:-

“10.In our opinion, if details are given by the respondent authority about the alleged bail orders in similar cases mentioning the date of the orders, the bail application number, whether the bail order was



WEB COPY



HCP.No.326 of 2024

passed in respect of the co-accused in the same case, and whether the case of the co-accused was on the same footing as the case of the petitioner, then, of course, it could be argued that there is likelihood of the accused being released on bail, because it is the normal practice of most courts that if a co-accused has been granted bail and his case is on the same footing as that of the petitioner, then the petitioner is ordinarily granted bail. However, the respondent authority should have given details about the alleged bail order in similar cases, which has not been done in the present case. A mere ipse dixit statement in the grounds of detention cannot sustain the detention order and has to be ignored.

11. In our opinion, the detention order in question only contains ipse dixit regarding the alleged imminent possibility of the accused coming out on bail and there was no reliable material to this effect. Hence, the detention order in question cannot be sustained.”

6. In view of the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in view of the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the view that the detention order is liable to be quashed.



HCP.No.326 of 2024

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the detention order passed by the second respondent on 31.01.2024 in No.10/BCDFGISSSV/2024, is hereby set aside and the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed. The detenu viz., Saravanan, Male, aged about 23 years, S/o.Sivakumar, is directed to be set at liberty forthwith, unless his confinement is required in connection with any other case.

[M.S.R., J]

[S.M., J]

19.06.2024

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Sni



HCP.No.326 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Secretariat, Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Police,
Avadi, Commissionerate.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal, Chennai.
- 4.The Inspector of Police (L&O),
T-12, Poonamallee Police Station,
Chennai.
- 5.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



HCP.No.326 of 2024

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Sni

H.C.P.No.326 of 2024

19.06.2024